DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 348 715 EA 024 154

AUTHOR Noble, Douglas D.
TITLE New American Schools and the New World Order.
PUB DATE Apr 92
NOTE 12p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April 20-24, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Corporate Support; *Educational Development; Elementary Secondary Education; Global Approach; *Public Schools
IDENTIFIERS *New American Schools Development Corporation

ABSTRACT

The New American Schools Development Corporation (NASDC) was established in 1991 by President Bush to funnel corporate funds into innovative designs for "new American schools." NASDC's board will decide on a few proposals that will receive up to $20 million each over 5 years to develop, implement, and market their designs. These selections promise to shape the directions of educational research, development, and policy for years to come. Since the NASDC represents a coordination of many of the principal corporate players in education reform across the nation, this paper briefly profiles the members of the NASCD board in order to contribute to a more general understanding of the intensified corporate presence in U.S. public education policy. Among the members are: James R. Jones, CEO of American Stock Exchange; James K. Baker, Arvin; John Clendenin of Bill South; Linda Wachner, CEO of Warnaco; and Louis Gerstner of RJR, etc. the members of the NASCD board in order to contribute to a more general understanding of the NASDC board members represent the cutting edge of a new global corporate order, aggressively and unsentimentally streamlining their work forces, shedding national allegiances, and evading regulatory constraints in pursuit of global competitive advantage. This paper discusses this posture first as it is directed toward NASDC's role within the New World Order and second as it is directed toward their own corporate organizations. Finally, there is an exploration of how this posture plays itself out in the promotion of the radical reinvention of public education through the design of new American schools. (RR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. Noble

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED348715

NEW AMERICAN SCHOOLS AND THE NEW WORLD ORDER

Douglas D. Noble

Paper presented at the Annual Meeting,
American Educational Research Association
San Francisco, CA
April, 1992

A few years ago, in an auditorium at the University of Rochester filled with local educators, I listened to Kay Whitmore, chief executive officer (CEO) of Eastman Kodak, Rochester's largest employer, talk about education reform. I was struck by three things. First, it was clear that he knew very little about schools, other than what his media people prepared for him, and yet he spoke with the authority accustomed to nobility. Second, he displayed a surprisingly short fuse and bristled when asked predictable questions about his motives in education reform. Third, he systematically sidestepped all questions about his own company, whose loss of 20,000 local jobs in ten years seemed to contradict his rhetoric about urgent workforce needs. So long as he was permitted to stick to his script, Whitmore presented himself as a congenial partner in education reform. Yet just beneath the surface, I was struck by how tenuous his interest in education seemed to be, and how hostile.

Since that time, Mr. Whitmore, along with the CEOs of a number of equally powerful multinational corporations, have come to sit on the board of the New American Schools Development Corporation (NASDC), which was established last spring by President Bush to funnel corporate funds into innovative designs for "new American schools." Although only about a quarter of the promised corporate funds have been raised, a feeding frenzy of public and private "design teams" in every state recently culminated in the submission of hundreds of proposals for models of replicable, "world class" schools. The handful of winners in this contest, who stand to receive up to $20 million each over five years to develop, implement, and market their designs, will be decided in late May by the NASDC board. Given the enormous sums involved, these selections promise to shape the direction of educational research, development and policy for years to come, and so we should know something about the corporate leaders making them. Furthermore, since NASDC represents a coordination of many of the principal corporate players in education reform across the nation, a fuller acquaintance with the members of the NASDC board contributes to a more general understanding of the intensified corporate presence in U.S. public education policy.

So who are these people? Although political pressure has forced the NASDC board to be expanded to include two former governors, a philanthropist, two women business leaders, the publisher of Black Enterprise magazine and the commissioner of the National Football League, most of the members of the NASDC board

EA 024 154

 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

remain white male CEOs of major U.S. multinational corporations. These include the NADSC board's three vice chairmen Frank Shrontz of Boeing, Louis Gerstner of RJR Nabisco and James K. Baker of Arvin Industries, as well as Kay Whitmore of Eastman Kodak, Robert Allen of AT&T, Norman Augustine of Martin Marietta, John Clendenin of BellSouth, James Renier of Honeywell, James Jones of the American Stock Exchange, John Hall of Ashland Oil, John Ong of B.F. Goodrich, and Lee Raymond, president of Exxon.

Three corporate leaders who played key roles in the formation of NASDC remain influential players behind the scenes. Paul O'Neill, CEO of Alcoa and John Akers, CEO of IBM, continue to serve as chairman and member, respectively, of the President's Education Policy Advisory Committee, and David Kearns, former CEO of Xerox is now Deputy Secretary of Education. Two other members of the original NASDC "core group" who have left NASDC are James Herr, CEO of Herr Foods and chair of the National Federation of Independent Businesses, and James Ketelson, former longtime CEO of Tenneco who lost his job in January to a toughminded new director now forcing the company into a "wrenching contraction." The departure of Herr and Ketelson from the NADSDC board suggests the minimal role of small business in NASDC and, as we shall see, its preference for toughminded, lean and mean, corporate strategists.

Over the past few months, I have attempted to learn something about the principal corporate leaders on the NASDC board, to put faces to these faceless corporate executives. Critics have raised concerns about the education agendas of some of these individuals, in particular their preference for parental choice and national examinations. While these are critical issues, I have chosen to step back to gain instead a perspective on these individuals in their roles as leaders of major multinational corporations, in order to understand how their commitment to education fits within their larger individual and collective corporate strategies.

I have looked at their Congressional testimony and public speeches, at corporate annual reports and proxy statements, at the minutes of the President's Education Policy Advisory Committee, and at published articles profiling these individuals, their corporations, and the business organizations which many of them lead or represent, including the Business Roundtable, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Alliance of Business, and the American Business Conference. My point has been to understand what these businessmen are about when they are not busy promoting school reform.

Some recent critics of business involvement in schools have cited the unethical practice and the devastating social consequences of American corporate policy over the last decade, resulting, for example, in the savings and loan scandals, junk bond mergers, plant closings, job dislocations and deterioration, wage concessions, tax breaks, and massive cuts in social services. Such critics highlight the glaring inconsistencies between corporate reform rhetoric, on one hand, and corporate practices contributing to the continued deterioration of education, on the other.

This critique, while provocative, suffers from its generality, which overlooks substantial differences within the American business community. More importantly, it fails to distinguish between those corporate leaders involved in education reform and those who are not. Here I explore the business priorities and agendas of those very corporate leaders most directly involved in the shaping of state and federal policy for public education. Some of what I have learned suggests that the general critique applies quite forcefully to many of the members of the NASDC board, illustrations of which will follow. There are indeed rather glaring inconsistencies between their commitment to education and their questionable corporate priorities and practices. But I wish to focus instead on an unexpected **consistency** between their corporate priorities and their commitment to school reform, a thread that emerged within my research that helps, I think, to explain both the tenuousness and the hostility of corporate commmitment to education that I witnessed at the talk given by Kodak's Kay Whitmore.

Together, the major players on the NASDC board represent the cutting edge of a new global corporate order, aggressively and unsentimentally streamlining their workforces, shedding national allegiances, evading regulatory constraints, in pursuit of global competitive advantage. Furthermore, if President Bush's New World Order is, above all, a posture toward the world, a declaration of renewed global hegemony through free trade, technological prowess and military power, these individuals not only epitomize this New World Order, some are among its key strategists. These corporate members on the NASDC board stand out among American businessmen; they view themselves as being in the vanguard of a bold new posture both towards the world economy and towards their own corporate organizations.

In each case, the words they and others use to characterize this posture are words repeated in my sources far too many times to ignore: They are said to be "aggressive," "ferocious" and "headstrong"; they are "firebrands," "terrorists," "militants," "cage rattlers," "rebels," "mavericks," "revolutionaries," "hawks," "buttkickers," "hellraisers," with an "attack mentality." These are the words, mind you, describing the posture of heads of major multinational corporations, not only toward their global competitors but toward their own corporate organizations. Some are also described as "quiet," "aloof," "secretive," even "clinical," and often intensely "moralistic." But the most common expression used, again and again, to describe their posture is this: "an iron fist in a velvet glove."

I will discuss this assaultive posture, first as it is manifest in their role within the New World Order, and second as it is directed towards their own corporate organizations. Finally, I will explore how this posture plays itself out in their promotion of the radical reinvention of public education through the design of New American Schools.

* * * * * * * * * * *

New World Order

The New World Order is characterized by the pursuit of unfettered competitive advantage of American corporations in the global economy, coupled to the promotion of a strong U.S. military presence worldwide. This translates into the corporate abandonment of particular national allegiances, the deregulation of corporate growth and capital formation, the pursuit of open markets and free trade, the vigorous support of military and industrial technological development, and the promotion of U.S. military hegemony throughout the world. The principal corporate members of the NASDC board are prominent champions of this "geostrategic" scenario.

James R. Jones, CEO of American Stock Exchange, former Oklahoma Congressman and chair of the House Budget Committee, has since lobbied strenuously for oil and gas interests, for deregulation, unencumbered capital formation, and lower capital gains taxes. He is also chairman of the American Business Conference (ABC), a consortium of fiercely aggressive, high growth, midsize U.S. companies whose priorities are global markets and worldwide production facilities. Leading lobbyists for free trade with Canada and now with Mexico, ABC firms combine global competitiveness with a loosening dependence on American workers. Already ABC firms derive 80% of their foreign revenues from production abroad.

James K. Baker of international auto parts conglomerate Arvin Industries and John Clendenin of BellSouth, one of the Baby Bells, each has served as recent chairman of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, in 1990 and 1991, respectively. The have led the Chamber's "business agenda for the 90s," spelled out in its publication **Nation's Business**. This agenda emphasizes that corporate America must "seize the opportunities presented by a continuing globalization of commerce"; must "make [free] trade a top national priority," including the reduction of "self-imposed export restrictions of U.S. products with potential military applications"; must resist tax increases and ensure that "growth of social programs ... be slowed to bring federal spending under control"; and must fight government regulations that "saddle business" with social welfare programs in such areas as health care, parental leave, disabled accommodation, job protections, consumer safety legislation, and environmental protection, including clean-air and land use regulations. The Chamber has recently been a major ally in Bush's America 2000 education agenda.

The Business Roundtable, whose education and human resources task forces have been chaired in recent years by Allen of AT&T, Akers of IBM, Clendenin of BellSouth, and Renier of Honeywell, was originally established in 1972 as a Congressional lobby of corporate CEOs out to prevent labor reform legislation and Ralph Nader's proposed Consumer Protection Agency. Its focus on reduction in taxes, regulations, labor union power, and government social

service spending has been similar to the Chamber of Commerce's, although it maneuvers through a polished veneer of compromise and genteel advocacy. A principal partner in Bush's America 2000 education policy, the Roundtable often proposes moderate legislative alternatives as preemptive measures against more drastic threats to its free reign. Recently, for example, Allen of AT&T, chair of the Roundtable's Human Resources Task Force, intervened in stalemated talks preventing passage of the Civil Rights Act. Viewing this intervention as an "image booster," Allen and the Roundtable quickly backed off, caving in to White House pressure.

Like the Chamber, the Business Roundtable also champions unrestricted global trade. Its principal lobbyist for the free trade agreement with Mexico, which is strenuously opposed by the AFL-CIO as a major threat to American labor, is Kodak's Kay Whitmore, who insists that his company "can't be held captive to a small upstate New York town" even as half of its $18 biiliion in sales already goes to foreign markets. Another key proponent of this Free Trade pact is Linda Wachner, latecomer to the NASDC board and CEO of textile and clothing manufacturer Warnaco. She led the apparel industry away from a coalition against free trade, thereby affording Bush an apparent victory in this piece of the New World Order. "Having a hemisphere of solid consumers and a hemisphere of flexible labor," she explains, "is a homerun for us."

Other NASDC members join her in their aggressive pursuit of unfettered global enterprise, including Louis Gerstner of RJR Nabisco, whose tobacco giant is engaged in "hardball tactics" to dismantle other countries' export restrictions in order to ensure massive cigarette exports, especially to third world populations, to counteract slugglish domestic sales. Renier's Honeywell exults in the expanse of his worldwide operations in controls technology: "We can bid something in the U.S., spec it in France, buy a part in Kuwait, and deliver it anywhere in the world."

Defense contractors Shrontz of Boeing and Augustine of Martin Marietta are major proponents of aggressive international sales of their aircraft and military technology. Shrontz's Boeing has in recent years been the nation's number one exporter. Shrontz was an impatient lobbyist just after the Tiananmen massacre for Most Favored Nation status for China, a coveted new market, and most recently he is promoting increased global sales of Boeing's AWACS airborne defense system. Martin Marietta, whose foreign sales are expected to rise from 8% in 1991 to 20% in 1994, is vigorously promoting the sale of its weapon systems to the Middle East. On the home front, Shrontz is engaged in an ongoing battle against Washington state taxpayers, "playing hardball" to maintain its $500 million tax exemption, much of which would otherwise go to the state's beleaguered school system. This is, of course, but one example of why, according to one account, the corporate share of local property taxes fell from 45% in 1957 to 16% in 1987.

The relation between NASDC members and the military thrust of the New World Order is most direct with Boeing's Shrontz and Martin Marietta's Augustine, although Allen's AT&T is engaged in a multibillion dollar contract with the Air Force, and Alcoa's O'Neill was a finalist as Bush's Undersecretary of Defense. Stanley Weiss, CEO of Ralstan Trading and another NASDC latecomer, is chair of Business Executives for National Security, an organization working to "apply the lessons of business to the business of defense," especially in the area of procurement, and even Paul Tagliabue, commissioner of the NFL, was formerly a defense policy analyst at the Pentagon.

Shrontz and Augustine, however, are the military point men on the NASDC board. Shrontz was Assistant Secretary of Defense and Assistant Secretary of the Air Force in the mid-1970s, while Augustine served three presidents in six key jobs at the Department of Defense. He has been called a "consummate insider" in U.S. defense policy and has "played a key role in the shaping of the modern U.S. arsenal." His contributions include overseeing the development of such weapon systems as the AWACS airborne defense system, the M-1 tank, and the Apache helicopter. Martin Marietta, one of the country's leading defense contractor, was responsible for infrared night vision systems and Patriot missile assembly for thre Gulf War, in addition to Titan IV missile systems. In his book **The Defense Revolution: Strategy for a Brave New World** (1990), Augustine promotes the unbridled development of advanced military technology, including the "three S's": Stealth aircraft, Strategic Defense Initiative ("Star Wars"), and Space systems. Arguing against the luxury of a "peace dividend" in competitive economic times, he insists that "we should, as a very last resort, be prepared to wage trade wars, just as we have been willing to wage military wars." A powerful high tech military, free from Congressional "micromanagement" and budgetary constraint, is the centerpiece of Augustine's military strategy for the New World Order.

Reinventing the Corporation, with a Vengeance

Having glimpsed the role of NASDC corporate leaders in their aggressive assault of a new worldwide military/corporate order, abandoning national allegiances and evading governmental constraints at every turn, let us glimpse this assaultive posture as it aimed at their own companies.

David Kearns, former CEO of Xerox and now Deputy Secretary of Education, uses a military analogy to explain his interest in education: "I came at the education problem as an economic and global competitive issue ... At the end of World War II a Navy cruiser had 1700 men on it. The average education level required to run the ship was perhaps eighth grade. Today a cruiser has 700 men and women on it, and the average education level is about two years beyond high school. That's American business. It's exactly the same." Now, Kearns' emphasis on increased skill levels is by now

common fare, but a key question systematically overlooked by Kearns and his corporate comrades in such analogies is this: What happened to those other 1000 sailors? This blind spot is most revealing.

A sizeable number of NASDC board members - Xerox's Kearns, Alcoa's O'Neill, RJR's Gerstner, IBM's Akers, Honeywell's Renier, AT&T's Allen - are credited with vigorously "reinventing" their corporations in recent years, some through a revised corporate culture or moral code, others through a focus on quality standards and customer service, and most through the dismemberment of the company into discrete business units. In all cases this radical reinvention of the corporation has been accomplished through the aggressive deployment of automation technology and through equally aggressive workforce reductions, or downsizing. As in the Navy analogy, the companies have been streamlined, made more productive, more technologically sophisticated, more devoted to "human capital" development, more attentive to quality - but not without a terrible cost in lost workers and, in many cases, irretrievable workforce security and morale. This story is not unfamiliar, but it is important to understand how this scenario has been played out, often with unusual ferocity and abandon, by the corporate leaders on the NASDC board.

Robert Allen, CEO of AT&T, cut 25,000 jobs when he was head of the company's information systems division, accounting for almost half of total jobs lost in the years after the AT&T breakup in 1984. This self-inflicted decimation of the company continues with Allen now at the helm, resulting in a massive loss of workforce morale. Allen has turned the company into a series of businesses, allowing him to "isolate the bad ones - and lop them off if they don't improve." At one point Allen even considered eliminating the Consumer Products Division, which would have unsentimentally removed AT&T from its original telephone manufacturing business. Allen has most recently threatened to replace 6000 operators with automated telephone answering equipment, against the fury of the communication workers union. The deployment of automation technology has fueled the downsizing of the so-called Baby Bells as well, including John Clendenin's BellSouth, which has trimmed 5000 high salary workers from its workforce since 1985 and is currently seeking to remove 3000 more management personnel through early retirement schemes.

Despite its highly touted no layoff policy, IBM managed to reduce its workforce by over 65,000 from 1986 to 1991, and its CEO Akers has announced a further reduction of 20,000 in 1992, mainly through what the company euphemistically calls MISs, or "management initiated separations." Akers, who received a 138% raise (to $4.6 million) in 1990, has nonetheless become increasingly ruthless in efforts to downsize the giant computer company, recently modeling his strategy after the example of international engineering conglomerate Asea Brown Boveri Group, which has a reputation for corporate efficiency through its unsentimental adherence to three principles: "trim the workforce, optimize globally, and avoid national allegiances." Akers, an ex-Navy pilot eager not to oversee

the decline of IBM "on his watch," is instead presiding over what has been called a "psychological reign of terror" throughout the company

Paul O'Neill, CEO of Alcoa, has many years of experience wielding a scalpel. As first Assistant Director and then Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget under Presidents Nixon and Ford, he was considered the "master technician" presiding over an OMB of "happy surgeons" who "wielded ax or scalpel over the prostrated body politic," terminating health, education, and community programs and exercising "drastic cuts" everywhere but defense. When O'Neill then went on to a succession of top executive positions at International Paper, the world's largest paper manufacturer, he embarked on a program of consolidation for competitiveness, closing plants, opening nonunion shops, and forcing wage concessions that ultimately precipitated "one of the most bitter labor-management confrontations in recent years." Coming to Alcoa, O'Neill once again quickly moved to close plants and he established a strict corporate moral code. This January, O'Neill stunned the company with a bold unilateral move that involved cutting three top layers of management and demanding "worldclass" accountability from Alcoa's 25 loosely coupled divisions, which now report directly to him, under a new threat of termination if they are deemed unproductive.

The corporations of other NASDC members have experienced similar fates. Kodak has suffered the loss of 20,000 jobs, a third of the local workforce, in a decade, with the continued threat, according to some, to reduce the local workforce by still another third, through outsourcing, subcontracting and the extensive use of contingent employment. Lee Raymond's Exxon has experienced an astonishingly "bold downsizing" effort that cut 100,000 workers, or 30% of its workforce, in two years. James Baker cut 4000 workers from Arvin Industries and, in an interesting twist, demanded wage concessions, from $11 to $8 an hour, in order to ratchet down to a "worldclass wage" structure. Meanwhile a recent headline read, "Swept away: Firm's values seem to shift as lean and mean wins, big happy family loses." This was the announcement last year of the latest round of 2500 local layoffs at Xerox.

So what are we to make of this whittling away by company after company, this radical restructuring by NASDC members in aggressive pursuit of a "lean and mean" corporate profile? Is this not merely the appropriate response to intensified international competition and inflated corporate bureaucracy, a response which will serve ultimately to buoy our competitive advantage in the world economy? The answer, I think, lies in the interpretation of the word "our." These corporate leaders have opted to improve their companies' productivity and market share on the backs of millions of people, in the process giving away the store, for short time gain. Critics have begun to question the dire longterm consequences wrought by this tradeoff of streamlined productivity for jobs, of fast track profits for investment in plant and infrastructure.

I have come to understand that the architects of these reinvented organizations think, first, of their own reputations, egos and place in the history of their corporations, and second, of their shareholders' pocketbooks. "Transformational leaders," wrote one business professor, "bring much of their personalities to the fore. Their egos are more visible and less controllable." I have found that an assaultive posture, an attack mentality, a maverick swagger, more than any external force, lies behind such radical destructuring, and, for better or worse, NASDC members are literally on the cutting edge of this wholesale corporate dismemberment.

Corporate Reinvention of Public Education

So what, then, does this assaultive posture of NASDC corporate leaders, both toward the world and toward their own corporations, tell us about corporate involvement in education reform? I think it begins to explain their sense of urgency, exemplified in hurried NASDC proposal deadlines; their "controlled impatience," as one scholar described their temperament; their upstart radicalism, embodied in a "break the mold" mentality; their bureaucratic disdain, despite their limited experience with education bureaucrats; their insistence on worldclass standards, still hopelessly undefined; and their peculiar arrogance and hostility toward the educational community.

Although these corporate leaders have entered into the education fray for a variety of reasons, they have brought their posture with them, full-blown, and are merely directing it, in a case of mistaken identity, toward the schools. In meetings of the President's Education Policy Advisory Committee, chairman O'Neill exhorts its members repeatedly, with exasperation, to "pressure the system," to "catalyze" action, to "force change," to "leverage" urgency, to "explode the bomb" (no doubt a veiled reference to NASDC being education's "Manhattan project"). Yet somehow there is a disingenuous tone to this urgency, a hollow ring to this radicalism, as compared to the real-life desperation and radicalism of a Jonathan Kozol or a Deborah Meier. These people are in the wrong movie, and it's dangerous.

Scholars have inquired about the motives, both explicit and implicit, underlying recent corporate involvement in school reform, using surveys of CEOs and other methods. They have found corporate motives to include the following: a personal interest in improving society and the plight of children; enlistment in an education president's call for corporate involvement; a perceived need for skilled or disciplined workers in a competitive economy; a need for a reliable domestic market of knowledgeable consumers; an opportunity to enhance their corporate image or appease their corporate conscience; a means to distract national attention from economic issues; a concern about the potential social dynamite of a growing underclass; and an opportunity to capitalize both on new school markets and new profitmaking education ventures.

To be sure, all of these, in varying degrees, underlie the involvement of the members of the NASDC board. Members have been most explicit, of course, about their need for a skilled workforce to remain competitive. Yet this rationale makes bewilderingly little sense, in light of their access to a global workforce and their termination of thousands of highly skilled workers, and in light of recent studies that contradict their earlier claims about "skill gaps" and skill shortages. One can but wonder if they believe these arguments any longer themselves. If anything, their interest in skilled workers must be understood in the context of Kearns's Navy cruiser analogy, training thousands to scramble for the few jobs on deck. And their professed interest in improving the social welfare flies in the face of their collective abandonment of national allegiances and their ongoing battle against societal encumbrances.

No doubt many are in the fray to "boost their image," just as AT&T's Allen entered, and quickly exited, the recent civil rights legislation stalemate. There is certainly a need for public relations among this lot, and not only because of the Exxon Valdez. John Hall of Ashland Oil has been convicted of questionable payments to foreign officials and stands accused of other corporate misconduct and mismanagement, while O'Neill's Alcoa has been called the nation's top industrial polluter and last year paid the largest fine ever levied in the U.S. in a hazardous waste case.

But Louis Gerstner of tobacco giant RJR Nabisco has the greatest need for an image boost, which probably explains $30 million school grants from the RJR Foundation and the company's recent gesture to pay the college tuition for its employees' children. Gerstner was hired away from the presidency of American Express by the firm whose leverage buyout of RJR was called by Time magazine "the worst display of greed since the ... robber barons." Since taking charge, Gerstner has been hit by several scandals, including the company's targeted marketing toward poor black youth and toward young, white, working class females; its aggressive cigarette exports to Third World populations; and, most recently, its blatant exploitation of young people through its "Old Joe Camel" advertising campaign. No wonder Gerstner signed on early as vice chair of the NASDC board. As one scholar puts it, "The tobacco industry has come to realize that a good deal of its prospects for success depend on ... its image, and to this end it has coupled philanthropy with its marketing efforts."

Motives aside, however, these corporate CEOs have entered the fray, and from all indications the "velvet gloves" of moderation are coming off, their "controlled impatience" is wearing thin. They are ready to throw their weight around, or else to retreat to their boardrooms, abandoning yet another thread in the social fabric with a newly won sense of justification. It is hard to tell which will happen first. Meanwhile they will make their selections of New American Schools, and no doubt many of these models will employ the latest advanced technologies, with flexible decentralization

schemes tied to strict, "worldclass" productivity standards.

These corporate leaders will also continue to "pressure the system" at the state and federal levels, waging their thankless war on a disintegrating school system through the promotion of national examinations and through such guerrilla tactics as parental choice schemes and privatized school enterprises. Their emphasis throughout will be on efficiency and productivity and competitiveness, not because they need the schools to be more efficient or productive or competitive, but because this is the only posture, the only game they know. Military strategist Norman Augustine of Martin Marietta explained his emphasis on education perhaps most succinctly of all: "We must accelerate the process of streamlining our society [just as we are] our economy." Such educational streamlining will, of course, only further exacerbate the "savage inequalities" now so entrenched in our schools, weeding out the "unproductive" thousands as so many displaced sailors or workers, and lopping off "unproductive" schools as so many dismembered business units. To conclude with a final military reference, we can only hope that these corporate leaders, for whose partnership we so desperately clamor, don't end up destroying the schools in order to save them.